Application No. 10/715,746 Applicants: Baker, Bays & El-Kik Reply to Action dated 09/28/2006

## Remarks

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks responsive to the Final Office Action of September 28, 2006 and the Advisory Action of January 5, 2007, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of this application.

## **Allowed Subject Matter**

Applicant respectfully thanks the Office for the indication claims 15, 18, 20, and 21 are allowed and that claims 7-14 are merely objected to.

## **Amendments**

Applicant has herein amended the claims to place them in allowable condition in accordance with the Final Office Action. Specifically, claims 15, 18, 20, and 21 already stand allowed and have not been amended.

Claims 7-14 were objected to as depending from a rejected base claim, but would otherwise be allowable if amended to include the limitations of their independent claims and any intervening dependent claims. Applicant has done so herein.

Specifically, former claim 7 previously depended from claims 1, 2, and 6.

Accordingly, Applicant has cancelled claim 7 and rewritten it as new independent claim 24 including the limitations of former claims 1, 2, 6, and 7.

Applicant has amended dependent claim 3 to depend from new claim 24.

Former claim 8 previously depended from claims 1, 2, and 6. Applicant has canceled former claim 8 and rewritten it as new independent claim 25 including the limitations of former claims 1, 2, 6, and 8.

Applicant also has added new dependent claim 26, which mirrors the language of dependent claim 3 but instead depends from new independent claim 25.

Dependent claim 9 previously depended from former claim 8 and has been amended to now depend from new claim 25.

Former claim 10 previously depended from claims 1, 2, and 6. Applicant has canceled former claim 10 and rewritten it as new independent claim 27 including the limitations of former claims 1, 2, 6, and 10.

Application No. 10/715,746 Applicants: Baker, Bays & El-Kik Reply to Action dated 09/28/2006

Applicant also has added new dependent claim 28, which mirrors the language of dependent claim 3 but instead depends from new independent claim 27.

Former claim 11 previously depended from claims 1, 2, and 6. Applicant has canceled former claim 11 and rewritten it as new independent claim 29 including the limitations of former claims 1, 2, 6, and 11.

Applicant also has added new dependent claim 30, which mirrors the language of dependent claim 3 but instead depends from new independent claim 29.

Former claim 12 previously depended from claims 1, 2, and 6. Applicant has canceled former claim 12 and rewritten it as new independent claim 31 including the limitations of former claims 1, 2, 6, and 12.

Applicant also has added new dependent claim 32, which mirrors the language of dependent claim 3 but instead depends from new independent claim 31.

Former claim 13 previously depended from claims 1, 2, and 6. Applicant has canceled former claim 13 and rewritten it as new independent claim 33 including the limitations of former claims 1, 2, 6, and 13.

Applicant also has added new dependent claim 34, which mirrors the language of dependent claim 3 but instead depends from new independent claim 33.

Former claim 14 previously depended from claims 1, 2, and 6. Applicant has canceled former claim 14 and rewritten it as new independent claim 35 including the limitations of former claims 1, 2, 6, and 14.

Applicant also has added new dependent claim 36, which mirrors the language of dependent claim 3 but instead depends from new independent claim 35.

Finally, Applicant has cancelled all other previously pending claims, namely, claims 2, 5, and 6.

Therefore, all remaining claims are not in allowable condition for the reasons set forth in the Final Office Action.

Applicants: Baker, Bays & El-Kik Reply to Action dated 09/28/2006

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted

that all claims remaining in this application are now in condition for allowance. Applicant

respectfully requests the Office to issue a Notice of Allowance at the earliest possible

date. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned counsel by telephone

call in order to further the prosecution of this case in any way.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 28, 2007 /Tr

/Theodore Naccarella/

Theodore Naccarella, Reg. No. 33,023

Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP

2600 Aramark Tower 1101 Market Street

Philadelphia, PA 19107

Telephone: (215) 923-4466 Facsimile: (215) 923-218 Attorneys for Applicant

TXN:pmf

S:\A\AGERE\Patents\P27120 USA\PTO\Supplemental\_response\_to\_28.06OX.doc

-12-